

Remarks/Arguments

This Supplemental Response is a follow-up to the Amendment filed March 2, 2004. Claims 1-20 are pending in this case as set forth in the March 2, 2004 Amendment, and in the above listing of claims.

In the March 2, 2004 Amendment, Claim 8 was amended to replace the word "invention" with the word -- method -- in line 1, and to replace the phrase "the identify" with the phrase -- an identity -- in line 3. Due to a word processing glitch, the strikeout line through the word "invention" and the phrase "the identify" in Claim 8 printed towards the bottom of those words, thus coming close to appearing somewhat like an underline. While a distinction is evident between the deleted words with the strikeout line and the added words having an underline, Applicants wish to clarify the same for the Examiner so as to avoid any confusion. Accordingly, the above listing of claims removes the potential for any confusion.

Further, in the Remarks/Argument Section of the March 2, 2004 Amendment, the first paragraph on page 8 stated:

Applicants, on the other hand, claim a method for providing traceability of mail pieces, wherein an encrypted source identification code is provided on each of the plurality of mail pieces via source identification code producing equipment. Cordery et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a source identification code on each of the plurality of mail pieces and on a mailing statement, as in Claim 1.

Applicants wish to clarify that the above paragraph was not intended to suggest that Claim 1 includes "an encrypted source identification code" or "source identification code producing equipment."


Applicants' independent Claim 1 claims a method for providing a traceability of mail pieces, wherein a first and a second source identification code are provided on each of the plurality of mail pieces and on a mailing statement, respectively. Specifically, Cordery et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a source identification code on each of the plurality of mail pieces and on a mailing statement, as in Claim 1. Applicants' Claim 3, dependent on Claim 1, claims that the first identification code is encrypted. Applicants' Claim 9, also dependent on Claim 1, claims the step of passing each of the plurality of mail pieces through identification code producing equipment.

For avoidance of doubt, please supplement the first paragraph on page 8 of the Amendment filed March 2, 2004, with the above remarks in order to resolve any possible ambiguities that may be perceived.

A postcard is enclosed evidencing receipt of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

PATULA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ch. T. Riggs Jr.", written in a cursive style.

Charles T. Riggs Jr.
Reg. No. 37,430
Attorney for Applicants

PATULA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
116 S. Michigan Ave., 14th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 201-8220

94C36